



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/222,833	12/30/1998	TADASHI OHASHI	1341.1025/JD	2628
21171	7590	08/24/2005	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			HUYNH, CONG LAC T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

**Application No.**

09/222,833

**Applicant(s)**

OHASHI, TADASHI

**Examiner**

Cong-Lac Huynh

**Art Unit**

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 June 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed 6/6/05 to the application filed on 12/30/98, priority 7/24/98.
2. Claims 10-14 are pending in the case. Claims 10, 13-14 are independent claims.
3. The rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite has been withdrawn in view of the amendment.
4. The rejections of claims 10-11, 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hager in view of Shakib have been withdrawn in view of Applicant's arguments.
5. The rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hager in view of Shakib, and further in view of Domen has been withdrawn in view of the amendment.

***Priority***

6. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:  
  
The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
8. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 12, which is dependent on claim 11, it is confusing whether the confirmation of the correctness of the replacing is performed by "automatically outputting an electronic email" (line 5) or by receiving a reply on the replacement within a predetermined time period (lines 10-11). It is suggested that Applicants clarify this feature which seems to be a request for confirmation first and then the actual confirmation after receiving the reply.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 10-11, 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hager et al. (US Pat No. 5,247,661, 9/21/93) in view of Shakib et al. (US Pat No. 5,787,262, 7/28/98, filed 6/26/96) and Doucet (US Pat no. 5,249,268, 9/28/93).

Regarding independent claim 10, Hager discloses:

- storing the electronic multimedia objects and a plurality of distribution target management tables corresponding to the electronic multimedia objects, each distribution target management table including attribute information comprising at least a corporate organization code and a corporate organization name corresponding to a distribution target of the corresponding electronic multimedia

Art Unit: 2178

object (col 2, lines 20-39, figure 4B: the code and description, which are attribute information equivalent to the organization code and the organization name *stored in the functional areas*, are used to *determine a preselected group of recipients in distributing an electronic document*; the electronic documents include electronic mails (col 1, lines 35-52) that may have text and graphics, thus the electronic documents are considered as multimedia documents or multimedia objects)

Hager does not explicitly disclose:

- communicating with a plurality of enterprise department servers and a master server, each enterprise department server managing at least one corporate organization and storing job information defining a job of the at least one corporate organization, the master server storing a plurality of master tables corresponding to the enterprise department server, each master table including master attribute information comprising at least a master corporate organization code and a master corporate organization name of the at least one corporate organization managed by the corresponding enterprise department server

However, Hager does teach:

- a data processing system which permits the automated distribution of an electronic document in accordance with a stored indication of the functional area of that document (col 2, lines 15-20, figure 3, #80)

Art Unit: 2178

- identifying a selected document and selecting a document profile including an identification of the technical or functional area within that document (col 2, lines 20-38, figure 3, #80)
- utilizing the examination of the document profile to determine a pre-selected group of recipients and automatically transmitting the document to those recipients (col 2, lines 20-38)
- establishing the functional area of a document in response to an examination of the department number, division, building, laboratory group, etc. associated with the creator or creators of the document (col 2, lines 30-38, figure 4B)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Hager to include such communicating since the document distribution in Hager to the functional areas of the documents where the list of functional areas are stored in the tables and where managing at least one corporation and storing job information defining at least a job of a least one corporate organization shows that the locations of the information storages are linked and communicated together to properly perform the document distribution.

Hager does not disclose:

- reading the attribute information in the corresponding distribution target management table stored in the storage unit, and the master attribute information in the master table stored in the master server

- comparing the corporate organization code and the corporate organization name of the read attribute information with the master corporate organization code and the master corporate organization name of the read master attribute information
- retrieving from the enterprise department server corresponding to the master corporate organization code of the read master attribute information, the job information defining the job of the at least one corporate organization stored, if determined that at least one of the corporate organization code and the corporate organization name of the read attribute information coincides with at least one of the read master attribute information
- determining whether the job defined by the retrieved job information coincides with a job to which the electronic multimedia object relates
- rewriting the attribute information in the corresponding distribution target management table of the electronic multimedia object, if determined that the attribute information does not coincide with the master attribute information and that the retrieved job information coincides with the job to which the electronic multimedia relates

Shakib discloses comparing the received properties to local properties to *check the conflict* between the received and local properties of the distributed data objects (figure 6, #148 and abstract) and resolving the conflict by *replacing the received properties with the latest version* (col 24, line 61 to col 25, line 57; figure 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Shakib into Hager for the following reason.

Art Unit: 2178

Comparing step in Shakib to check the conflict between the received properties and the local properties of an object inherently shows the reading of the same type of data from different locations, which is considered equivalent to reading and comparing the attribute information in the storage unit and in the master server. Further, *resolving the conflict* by replacing the received properties with the latest version shows rewriting the information of an object *if it is determined different from the information of the object stored in the master files*. The combination of Shakib into Hager would provide an effective tool for checking data stored in the central files and the local files for a data matching and updating to distribute documents properly.

Hager and Shakib do not disclose that the reading, comparison, retrieval, determination, and rewriting are carried out according a predetermined cycle.

Doucet disclose that data in global entities and in local entities are checked and updated periodically to maintain the correctness of data in the main database and the local database (col 5, lines 1-10, 62-67 to col 6, line 8, lines 32-45, col 7, lines 33-40, 60-61, col 8, lines 22-31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Doucet into Hager and Shakib since checking and updating data periodically shows that reading, comparison, retrieval, determination, and rewriting data are carried out in a predetermined cycle. This motivates to incorporate into Hager and Shakib for effectively maintaining correct data as well as providing proper data to the receivers.



Regarding claim 11, which is dependent on claim 10, Hager does not disclose:

- replacing one of the corporate organization code and the corporate organization name of the attribute information included in the read distribution target management table, which does not coincide with one of the master corporate organization code and the master corporate organization name of the read master attribute information, such that the attribute information in the read distribution target management table coincide with the master attribute information

Shakib discloses comparing the received properties to local properties to *check the conflict* between the received and local properties of the distributed data objects (figure 6, #148 and abstract) and resolving the conflict by *replacing the received properties with the latest version* (col 24, line 61 to col 25, line 57; figure 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Shakib into Hager for the following reason.

Resolving the conflict by replacing the received properties with the latest version after comparing the difference between the received properties and the local properties of a data object shows rewriting the information of the object *if it is determined different from the information of the object stored in the master files*. The combination of Shakib into Hager would provide an effective tool for periodically checking data stored in the central files and the local files for a data matching and updating to distribute documents properly. This combination further applies to compare the corporate organization code and the name of the attribute information stored in the master files and the corporate

organization code and the name of the attribute information stored in the memory unit, which are equivalent to the same type of data stored at different storages of the local files and the master files, and replace the one with the other if the data in the local files is different, which means it does not coincide, from the data in the master files.

Claims 13-14 are for a computer-readable medium of method claims 10-11, and are rejected under the same rationale.

### ***Response to Arguments***

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 10-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicants argue that Hager and Shakib does not disclose that the comparison, retrieval, and rewriting are carried out according to a predetermined cycle (Remarks, page 9).

Examiner agrees.

Doucet, in combination with Hager and Shakib, discloses the argued feature.

### ***Conclusion***

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Thomas et al. (US Pat No. 5,481,294, 1/2/96, filed 3/1/02).

Slivka et al. (US Pat No. 6,256,668 B1, 7/3/01, filed 10/9/98, priority 4/18/96).

Art Unit: 2178

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is 571-272-4125. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-4125.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Cong-Lac Huynh  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2178  
8/18/05